

REMARKS

In response to the restriction requirement set forth by the Examiner, Applicant had elected Claims 1-8 for further prosecution and had withdrawn Claims 9-11 without prejudice. Thus, Claims 1-8 are currently pending in the present application, none of which has been amended.

Claims 7-8 were objected under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) because a multiple dependent claim cannot serve as a basis for any other multiple dependent claim. However, none of Claims 6-8 are multiple dependent claims, and neither Claim 7 nor Claim 8 depends on Claim 6. Thus, the claim objections to Claims 7-8 are believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for not particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses such rejection.

Claim 6 recites "a ceiling," instead of "the ceiling" as asserted by the Examiner, and no antecedent basis is required. As such, the § 112 rejection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Ensley* (US 3,166,810). Applicant respectfully traverses such rejection.

Claim 1 recites "an elongated housing for slidably receiving a cable axially thereof, said housing being configured to permit an end of said cable to leave said housing and be received back by said housing to form a cable loop." Thus, according to the claimed invention, the cable loop (*i.e.*, loop 180 in Figure 2B) for a cable installer to pull the cable is actually formed by the cable itself.

In contrast, two lengths 14 of a flexible wire rope that forms a loop portion 15 within protective sleeve 18 shown in Figures 1-2 of *Ensley* are not the cable being pulled. The cable

being pulled in *Ensley* is a cable 2 having multiple wire strands 5, as shown in Figures 6 and 8. Because Claim 1 recites novel features that are not taught or suggested by *Ensley*, the § 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-8 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicant believes that independent Claim 1 along with its dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner, but not relied upon, has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0449.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Cap. of Texas Hwy, suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS